



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

II.—THE LITERARY FORM OF HORACE SERM. I 6

(AD MAECENATEM DE VITA SUA).

In the following remarks on the famous composition which I have named in my title, I would call the attention of fellow Horatian students to certain features of literary form and stylistic treatment which, if they have been observed by others, do not seem to be recorded in the exegetical literature of this poem. I have dragged out of well-merited obscurity the superscription of the pseudo-Acronian scholia (if I understand aright Hauthal's perplexing apparatus), because it contains a suggestion at least of the point of view which I would here present, viz., the encomiastic-biographical, or in this case rather the encomiastic-autobiographical. That, like so much of ancient biography (and autobiography), our poem is written with an apologetic tendency which leads to self-laudation, is sufficiently obvious, and Horace himself confesses to this in the disavowal of the vulgar apology for low birth in 92: *non sic me defendam*, and in the deprecatory words, *ut me collaudem*, in 70.

That which has, however, apparently been overlooked, is the fact that this encomiastic-apologetic tendency finds expression in a treatment of the subject matter and in a stylistic tone established by the literary usage of centuries, and inculcated by the precepts of literary theory. It is not my purpose to force Horace into a rhetorical strait-jacket: I would only record what is obviously present. For the composition yields, without constraint, a good illustration of the persistence of more or less definitely fixed canons for the treatment of a special type of subject-matter. The recognition of them will not greatly affect the interpretation of the satire in detail, but it will contribute in some degree to placing the modern reader in the position of the audience for whom the work was written, and it will be found to explain certain features of style which Horace does not often reveal elsewhere in his satires.

The motive for writing Horace states simply in verses 45-48:

Nunc ad me redeo libertino patre natum,
quem rodunt omnes libertino patre natum:
nunc, quia sim tibi, Maecenas, convictor, at olim,
quod mihi pareret legio Romana tribuno.

It is the desire to meet the sneers of the jealous world by showing how little sting there was for him in the reproach *libertino patre natus*, and to confront the suggestion that his position with Maecenas was but a happy turn of the wheel of fortune. Plutarch remarks that to praise oneself is without censure if it be done in self-defense against attack,¹ and under this shield Horace may find justification. But the poet defends himself not in the spirit of apology, but rather in the tone of confident self-praise, the assurance of which he derives from the favor of Maecenas and his friends, and from the character of his father.

Apart from the digression in vss. 23 (*sed fulgente*) to 45 (*nunc ad me redeo*), which may here be passed over, the literary form, as disclosed in the points of view from which the argument is conducted, shows general observance of the theory and practice of encomiastic literature.² The topics of personal encomium are of course very numerous, and in the older theory (which Cicero, Quintilian and Theon preserve) they were not arranged in accordance with any hard and fast rules, such as the later Greek rhetoricians present. But it must always have been most natural that the topics which have to do with the different stages of life should follow in a certain sequence.³ The order which Hermogenes presents will suffice for illustration (Spengel, R. G. II, p. 12): *γένος, τροφή, ἀγωγή, φύσις ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος, ἐπιτηδεύματα, πράξεις*. The topic *γένος* is naturally the first, and with this Horace begins:

- I Non quia, Maecenas, Lydorum quidquid Etruscos
incoluit finis, nemo generosior est te,
nec quod avus tibi maternus fuit atque paternus,
olim qui magnis legionibus imperitarent,

¹ De se ipso citra invidiam laudando 4: αὐτὸν δ' ἐπαινεῖν ἀμέμπτως ἔστι, πρῶτον μὲν ἂν ἀπολογούμενος τοῦτο ποιῆς πρὸς διαβολήν κτλ.

² A good illustration of the ancient attitude toward such details of rhetorical technique as are here involved is afforded by the words of Crassus in de Or. I 138: non negabo me ista omnium communia et contrita praecepta didicisse . . . (141) certos esse locos quibus in iudiciis uteremur . . . alios in deliberationibus . . . alios item in audationibus, in quibus ad personarum dignitatem omnia referrentur.

³ Quintil. III 7, 15: namque alias aetatis gradus gestarumque rerum ordinem sequi speciosius fuit, ut in primis annis laudaretur indoles, tum disciplinae, etc.

- 5 ut plerique solent, naso suspendis adunco
ignotos, ut me libertino patre natum.
cum referre negas, quali sit quisque parente
natus, dum ingenuus, persuades hoc tibi vere,
ante potestatem Tulli atque ignobile regnum
10 multos saepe viros nullis maioribus ortos
et vixisse probos amplis et honoribus auctos;

His own birth obviously did not admit of simple encomiastic treatment, and he employs, therefore, the conventional resource with which the situation was met in the literature of this type. The two possible points of view are given by Quintilian (III 7, 10): ante hominem patria ac parentes maioresque erunt, quorum duplex tractatus est: aut enim respondisse nobilitati pulchrum erit aut humilius genus illustrasse factis. (Cf. Theon, Sp. II III, 27: ἐπαίνετός τε καὶ εἴ τις ἐκ ταπεινῆς οἰκίας ὦν μέγας ἐγένετο.) It is of course the latter method of treatment¹ which Horace employs, basing his contention of the insignificance of birth not on his own authority but on the conviction of Maecenas (*cum referre negas, etc.*) Servius Tullius, as a type of man whose career illustrated the essential insignificance of birth, had doubtless seen long service in literature,² and the phraseology of Horace, *ante potestatem Tulli*, suggests an effort to win a little freshness from the trite example.

Passing over the considerable digression which grows out of this topic, we return to the words cited above, which contain the cause for the jealous criticism directed against Horace. He then continues:

- dissimile hoc illi est, quia non, ut forsit honorem
50 iure mihi invidet quivis, ita te quoque amicum,
praesertim cautum dignos adsumere, prava
ambitione procul. Felicem dicere non hoc
me possim, casu quod te sortitus amicum;
nulla etenim mihi te fors obtulit: optimus olim
55 Vergilius, post hunc Varius dixere quid essem.

In these words Horace takes up a familiar topic of encomiastic treatment—*felicitas* (τύχη), but not with the end of showing the gifts which fortune had bestowed upon him (as the encomiast of

¹ Cf. Epp. I 20, 22: ut quantum generi demas virtutibus addas.

² Cf. Livy IV 3, Seneca Rhet. Controv. I 6, 4 and VII 6, 18 (Albucius et philosophatus est: dixit neminem natura liberum esse neminem servum . . . rettulit Servium regem).

another might), but to show that the friendship with Maecenas rested upon the judgment of his own worth which Virgil and Varius, and Maecenas himself had made. The theorists of encomium reiterate that while goods of fortune may be named as sources of praise, yet the chief material of encomium are those things which are the result of one's own choice or volition. For example, Theon, l. c. 111, 17: ἥκιστα γὰρ ἐπαινοῦσι μὴ κατὰ προαίρεσιν ἀλλ' ἐκ τύχης ἃ ἔχουσιν ἀγαθά. Horace then recounts the charming and simple story of his introduction to Maecenas and of his reception into the circle. In drawing the conclusion that he had won his place not by noble birth but by the worth of his character (*vita et pectore puro*) he claims for his own merit the praise of the honor conferred (cf. the pseudo-Acronian scholium on line 52: neque casu aliquo neque beneficio fortunae factus sum tibi amicus, sed beneficio meo). He adds further an element of praise to himself in naming the judgment of his friends Virgil and Varius, and especially that of Maecenas (*qui turpi secernis honestum*). Cf. Theon, l. c. 110, 25: δεῖ δὲ λαμβάνειν τὰς κρίσεις τῶν ἐνδόξων, and pseudo-Acro (ad vs. 47): verae virtutis est et certi meriti *Maecenatis iudicio* comprobari.

There follows then a passage of self-praise which carries out in more detail the assurance of essential worth which he has derived from Maecenas' approbation:

- 65 Atqui si vitiis mediocribus ac mea paucis
mendosa est natura, alioqui recta, velut si
egregio inspersos reprehendas corpore naevos,¹
si neque avaritiam neque sordes nec mala lustra,
obiciet vere quisquam mihi, purus et insons,
70 ut me collaudem, si et vivo carus amicis.

These words set forth the topic which Hermogenes (as cited above, p. 389) designates as φύσις (cf. *natura* in 66) τῆς ψυχῆς, and Theon (l. c. 109, 29) τὰ περὶ ψυχὴν καὶ ἥθος. The offense of direct self-laudation Horace softens in various ways which may be illustrated by theoretical precepts. So Plutarch says that 'those who advance their own praises not as wholly cloudless and unalloyed, but with insertion of certain defects or failures or slight blemishes, deprive their mention of invidiousness.'² It is

¹ See note on this passage at the bottom of p. 399.

² De se ipso laud. 13: οὕτως ἐνιοὶ τοὺς αὐτῶν ἐπαίνους μὴ παντελῶς λαμπροὺς μὴδ' ἀκράτους προσφέροντες, ἀλλὰ τινὰς ἐλλείψεις ἢ ἀποτεύξεις ἢ ἀμαρτίας ἐλαφρὰς ἐμβάλλοντες, ἀφαρροῦσι τὸ ἐπαχθὲς αὐτῶν.

such a form which Horace here uses (*atqui si vitiis mediocribus, etc.*). If we note further the contingent form of expression which is employed (*si*), the use of the deprecatory *ut me collaudem*, and finally that the merit which he thus modestly claims is referred to his father as its source,¹ we shall see that every resource has been employed to deprive self-praise of arrogance or offense.

The assignment to his father of whatever merit there might be in the qualities commemorated leads Horace, by natural transition, to describe the education (*ἀγωγή*) and training (*τροφή*) which he owed to him. The former topic precedes:

- 71 *causa fuit pater his, qui macro pauper agello*
noluit in Flavi ludum, me mittere
.
sed puerum est ausus Romam portare docendum, etc.

His training (*τροφή*) under the watchful care of his father himself (if it be right to separate this topic from the preceding²) then follows:

- 81 *ipse mihi custos incorruptissimus omnis*
circum doctores aderat. Quid multa? pudicum,
qui primus virtutis honos, servavit, etc.

The words *qui primus virtutis honos* are significant of the literary atmosphere of the whole composition. For as encomium, in the definition of Hermogenes (Sp. II 12, 5), *ψιλήν ἀρετῆς ἔχει μαρτυρίαν*, so its separate items are *τὰ καλὰ*—*honesta, honores* (cf. Cic. de Inv. II 159: *est igitur in eo genere [i. e. honestum] omnis res una vi atque uno nomine amplexa virtus*). Purity, therefore, the primary honor of that *virtus*, to the portrayal of which the whole composition looks, his father secured for him. The conclusion touches by suggestion the disinterested motives of the father in providing his son with such an education, and the passage concludes with the grateful outburst:

- 89 *nil me paeniteat sanum patris huius*

harking back to the introduction of this description, *causa fuit pater his*.

¹ On *pietas*, as imposing an obligation to commemorate the merits of others, or as here justifying self-praise, see The Proconsulate of Julius Agricola, pp. 6 and 7 (Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago, vol. VI).

² Cf. Epp. II 2, 41: *Romae nutrir mihi contigit atque doceri*.

The remainder of the poem is devoted to drawing the conclusions for Horace's own philosophy of life, tastes and daily occupations (*ἐπιτηδεύματα*) which have resulted from the possession of such a father. The manner is that of adoxographical, almost paradoxical (*demens iudicio volgi*), encomium, in that so far from apologizing for humble birth he finds in this the very foundation of his happiness and contentment. For the station to which it has assigned him enables him to lead a life freed from the constraints and cares which are incident to noble birth. The thought is carried out first negatively—

100 nam mihi continuo maior quaerenda foret res
atque salutandi plures, etc.,

and then positively, in the fascinating picture of his own daily life, which is the crowning charm of a composition rich in genuine and simple beauties.

The purpose of the topic *ἐκ τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων* in encomium is to employ the characteristic occupations, interests or tastes of a man (*ποῖον ἐπετήδευσε βίον*, Hermog., *ζῆλοι*, Polybius, v. note) as an index of character. The meaning of the word is sometimes narrowed by the theorists too much,¹ but on the whole it pre-

¹ Hermogenes, in adding to the explanation given above (*ποῖον ἐπετήδευσε βίον*) *φιλόσοφον ἢ ῥητορικὸν ἢ στρατιωτικόν* (l. c. 12, 18), means only to suggest characteristic tastes or pursuits. But Priscian, with some misconception of Hermogenes' meaning, translated: *postea laudabis a professionibus*, id est quod officium professus est philosophum vel rhetoricum vel militare (Keil, G. L. III, p. 436, 12). Cf. the Glossae Graeco-Latinae in Goetz, vol. II, p. 311, 55: *ἐπιτήδευμα institutum inceptum studium professio*, and the Thesaurus Gloss. emendat. s. v. *professio*. The definition of Menander is very good, though unfortunately Spengel has corrupted it by unjustifiable change: *ἐπιτηδεύματ' εἰσιν ἀνευ ἀγόνων πράξεις ἡθικαί* (Spengel reads *ἀνευ ἀγόνων ἡθη*, III 372, 4). Any characteristic pursuit consists in acts. These may be of significance for the characterization of the actor (*πράξεις ἡθικαί*) and yet be wholly unimportant as deeds in themselves, i. e. *ἀνευ ἀγόνων*. Cf. Men., p. 384, 20: *ἐπιτηδεύματα γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐνδειξις τοῦ ἡθους καὶ τῆς προαιρέσεως τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀνευ πράξεων ἀγωνιστικῶν*. A general definition of *ἐπιτηδεύματα*, without reference to this use as a topic of encomium, is cited by Stephanus from Galen (Kühn, vol. XVII, pars I, p. 210, extr.), and it is worth giving in this connection. Hippocrates, in naming the resources of diagnosis, mentions *ἐκ τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων* (Kühn, l. c., p. 204). Galen comments: *καλοῦσι δ' ἐπιτηδεύματα πάντα ὅσα πράττονται οἱ ἄνθρωποι διὰ χρεῖαν ἢ ἀνάγκην, εἴτε ναντιλλόμενοι εἴτε γεωργοῦντες, ἢ οἰκοδομοῦντές τε καὶ τεκταίνόμενοι, κνηγετοῦντες ἢ φιλογυμναστοῦντες, ὥς λοῦεσθαι πολλάκις ἐν ὕδασι θερμοῖς ἢ ψυχροῖς*. For *ζῆλοι* v. Polybius X 25, 2 and 4.

serves its classical significance. This meaning and the use made of the topic in encomium are well illustrated by Demosthenes, Olynth. III 32: *οἱποῖ' ἅττα γὰρ ἂν τάπιτθεύματα τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἦ, τοιοῦτον ἀνάγκη καὶ τὸ φρόνημα ἔχειν*. Thus the description of the sort of life which Horace leads (*haec est vita solutorum misera ambitione*) serves as evidence for the claim of worth and of absence of vulgar ambition which it is his purpose to establish. Recalling, finally, that similar evidence has been derived from his education and training, one may conclude with the words of the rhetorician Menander (Sp. III 420, 14): *πιστώση (τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς εὐφυΐαν) διὰ τριῶν κεφαλαίων τῶν ἐξῆς, λέγω δὲ διὰ τῆς ἀνατροφῆς καὶ τῆς παιδείας καὶ τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων*.

The preceding analysis of the points of view (*τόποι*) from which Horace treats his life has shown general conformity to literary usage and precept for encomiastic composition. But there remain several further indications of encomiastic treatment to which attention may be called.

Encomium differs from objective narrative (historical or otherwise) in that it is not satisfied with the mere record of praiseworthy traits or deeds: for examples of conspicuous performance (*πράξεις*) or the record of other biographical items are not given for their own sake, but as indications of the *virtus* to which the whole presentation looks. This point of view is fully developed in the encomia of Isocrates (cf. Euag. 33: *ῥάδιον ἐκ τούτων γνῶναι τὴν ἀρετὴν*) and dominates the form throughout its whole subsequent history. Accordingly, at the end of each important episode or description, it is usual to find an outburst of praise in the form of an interpretative *σῆξις*, setting forth the significance of the situation which has just been narrated as evidence for the character of the subject of encomium. Cf. Doxopater, Walz II 412, 32: *ἐν δὲ τῷ ἐγκωμίῳ οὐ μόνον τὰ προσόντα τινὶ καλὰ λέγομεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπ' ἐκείνοις θαυμάζομεν*. The manner will be readily recognized, but one or two examples will not, perhaps, be superfluous. Isocrates, de Bigis 28 (after a biographical narrative of the parentage of the younger Alcibiades) adds: *ἡγοῦμαι γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο εἶναι τῶν καλῶν κτλ.*, and Nepos, having described the character of Atticus' life at Athens, and the devotion of the Athenians to him, continues (3, 3): *igitur illud munus fortunae . . . hoc specimen prudentiae quod, cum in eam se civitatem contulisset quae anti-quitate humanitate doctrinaque praestaret omnes, unus ei fuit*

there is here an extraordinary piling up of the negative side of each subject or situation, before the presentation of the positive features which would suffice for simple narrative. For example (I italicize the first word of the positive antitheses):

- 1 non, quia Maecenas, etc. nec, quod avus, etc., ...
suspendis ignotos *cum* referre negas.
- 52 felicem dicere non hoc me possim, etc. nulla
etenim mihi te fors obtulit: *optimus* olim, etc.
- 58 non ego me claro natum patre, non ego circum *sed*
quod eram, etc.
- 64 non patre praeclaro, *sed* vita et pectore puro
- 68 si neque avaritiam, etc. (*si*) *purus* et insons
- 72 noluit in Flavi ludum me mittere *sed* puerum est
ausus Romam portare, etc.
- 85 nec timuit neque ego essem questus: *at* hoc nunc
- 90 non sic me defendam: *longe* mea discrepat
istis et vox et ratio (which is then carried out in the
following sentence, *nam*, etc.).
- 99 nollem onus . . portare molestum (which is then described
in 100) *nunc* mihi curto.
- 119 non sollicitus *ad quartam* iaceo.
- 124 non quo
- 127 non avide

That the accumulation of sentences of this kind is really remarkable and a distinctive feature of the style of this composition the reader may readily verify by comparison with other satires. That it is peculiar to encomiastic style would of course be saying too much, for it is obvious that the figure may for instance be employed in refutatory argument, as in the Lucretian lines:

non radii solis neque lucida tela diei
discutiant, sed naturae species ratioque.

But inasmuch as it throws strong emphasis on a positive assertion or description, with contrast of an opposing element, it lends itself readily to vigorous expression of praise or blame. For the

figure may of course be employed from the opposite point of view in invective or censure (*ψόγος*, the counterpart of *ἐγκώμιον*), as in the Horatian imprecation on *irae* :

non Dindymene, non adytis quatit,
etc.

Ἀναίρεσις is the name which the Greek rhetoricians give to the figure, and the typical example which they cite are the great words of Demosthenes: οὐ λίθοις ἐτείχισα τὴν πόλιν οὔτε πλίνθοις ἐγώ, ἀλλ' ἐὰν τὸν ἐμὸν τειχισμὸν θέλῃς μαθεῖν, εὐρήσεις ὄπλα καὶ πόλεις καὶ τόπους καὶ λιμένας, which Aristides quotes in the chapter *περὶ σεμνότητος*, with these words of explanation (Sp. II 466, 24): καὶ τὸ τὰ ἥττον ἐκτετιμημένα ἐκβάλλοντα καὶ ἀναιροῦντα ἀντεισάγειν τὰ μᾶλλον προτετιμημένα τῆς σεμνότητός ἐστιν.¹ The figure is named as one of the resources of encomiastic style by the rhetorician Apsines (Sp. I² 257, 20: ἐξ ἀναιρέσεως τὰ πολλὰ εἰσάγοντα) and—though for our examples it can scarcely be called significant or true—as a device by which the invidiousness of praise may be counteracted.²

From what has been said it is apparent that *ἀναίρεσις* always involves a comparison, and that brings us to another fundamental precept of the ancient theory of encomium; for, in the words of Hermogenes, *μεγίστη ἐν τοῖς ἐγκωμίοις ἀφορμὴ ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν συγκρίσεων* (Sp. II 13, 3). *Σύγκρισις* is of course of much wider range than the stylistic figure of *ἀναίρεσις*, but it embraces the latter. I shall perhaps not be digressing too widely if I illustrate here, by a few typical examples from famous passages of encomium, the conjunction of these two marks of encomiastic style. A striking and admirable illustration is afforded by the praise of Italy in the second book of the *Georgics*:

136 sed neque Medorum silvae ditissima terra
nec pulcher Ganges atque auro turbidus Hermus
laudibus Italiae certent, non Bactra neque Indi
.
haec loca non tauri spirantes naribus ignem
invertere
nec galeis densisque virum seges horruit hastis:
sed gravidæ fruges et Bacchi Massicus umor
implevere;

¹ Cf. Hermogenes π. *ιδέων* (Sp. II 307, 3) in the chapter *περὶ λαμπρότητος: σχήματα λαμπρὰ ὅσα καὶ εὐειδῆ, οἷον αἱ ἀναιρέσεις*.

² The example from Demosthenes is cited in the same connection by Plutarch, *de se ipso laud.*, ch. 12.

and the positive praise of Italy which follows. It becomes negative once more at 151:

at rabidae tigres absunt et saeva leonum
semina, nec miseros fallunt aconita legentis,
nec rapit immensos orbis per humum neque tanto, etc.

Again, the encomium of Augustus in Aeneid VI 791:

hic vir, hic est, tibi quem promitti saepius audis
Augustus Caesar, divi genus

801 nec vero Alcides tantum telluris obivit.

nec qui pampineis victor iuga flectit habenis
Liber, etc.

Finally, the exquisite passage in praise of the simple pleasures of true philosophy in Lucretius II 23:¹

neque natura ipsa requirit
si non aurea sunt iuvenum simulacra per aedes
.
nec domus argento fulget auroque renidet
nec citharae reboant laqueata aurataque tecta,
cum tamen inter se prostrati in gramine molli, etc.

To return, then, to our satire, we observe that each principal topic is carried out in the form of a syncrisis more or less fully developed. *ῥένος*: The attitude of Maecenas toward lowly birth is contrasted with the sneers of others, not only by the negative form of expression (*non . . . suspendis*), but also by a phrase of direct comparison—*ut plerique solent*.² The negative form is reinforced in a similar manner in 90 below (*non ut magna pars*). *τύχη*: With the suggestion of mere luck, to which his position was attributed, is contrasted the discerning judgment of Maecenas (*κρίσεις τῶν ἐνδόξων*). *Ἀγωγή*: The contrast between the school

¹The whole of this prooemium affords almost continuous illustration of syncrisis presented in the rhetorical figure of *ἀνάλψεως*. The prooemium to Book V (encomium of Epicurus) is a carefully wrought out syncrisis of another type, contrasting the merits of Epicurus, first with those of Ceres and Liber—*confer enim divina aliorum antiqua reperta* (13)—and then with those of Hercules (22): *Herculis antistare autem si facta putabis*.

²On the use of such expressions ([*non*] *ut plerique*, [*non*] *alius, ceteri*, etc.) in encomiastic and characterizing description, I have made some observations in The Proconsulate of Julius Agricola, esp. pp. 9, 12 and 15.

of Flavius and the best educational advantages which Rome afforded is continued further in the contrast, which the superlative *incorruptissimus custos* (81) implies, to the neglect which was common in protecting the school-boy from allurements to impurity (τροφή). The point is noted by the pseudo-Acronian scholium on *incorruptissimus*: ad comparationem aliorum.¹

The final topic, ἐπιτηδεύματα, is a more elaborated syncrisis than any of the preceding. The negative side sets forth the burdens of life which Horace must have borne in higher station (100), a description which develops into a picture of the cumbersome retinue with which he must have been attended whenever he ventured abroad. With this is contrasted the unconstraint of his life as it is in this respect (*nunc mihi curto*). The two situations are concluded with the words which point the moral of the comparison:

110 hoc ego commodius quam tu praeclare senator
milibus atque aliis vivo.

To the proof for the generalizing words *milibus atque aliis* the poet then passes over in the further description of his daily life:

quacumque libido est
112 incedo solus, etc.

It is carried out in a series of descriptions, nearly all of which contain elements of syncrisis, either tacit or explicit,² with allusion to which the satire concludes:

130 his me consolor victurum suavius ac si
quaestor avus pater atque meus patruusque fuisset.

G. L. HENDRICKSON.

¹ Cf. Menander, l. c., p. 372, 21: τίθει δὲ καὶ σύγκρισιν ἐφ' ἐκάστῳ τῶν κεφαλαίων τούτων, αἱ συγκρίσεις φύσιν φύσει καὶ ἀνατροφὴν ἀνατροφή καὶ παιδείαν παιδείᾳ.

² The ἀναιρέσεις *non quo fraudatis immundus Natta lucernis* (124) was of course a shaft with barbed point for contemporary readers. Merely as a form of negative praise of *olivo*, it is obviously a trifle rancid.

[NOTE on vss. 65-67. Although irrelevant to my argument, I would use this opportunity to indicate a striking parallel to the not wholly pleasing comparison of vs. 67. It is the conclusion of a literary judgment on the περιήγησις of Dionysius (Bernhardy, p. 82, 13): εἰ δὲ τις ἐχει καὶ κῆρας βραχυτάτας (*atqui si vitii mediocribus ac mea paucis mendosa est natura*), καθά που σῶμα καλὸν δοθιγνὰς τις οὐ προφανείς τοῖς πολλοῖς ἢ λειχῆνας παρεμπεφυκῆτας οὐκ ἐν καιρίῳ (*velut si egregio inspersos reprehendas corpore naevos*), ἅφ' ὧν ἥκιστα τὸ πολὺ τοῦ κάλλους ἀχρειοῦνται (*alioqui recta*), σκεπτέσθωσαν οἱ περίεργοι].